

1 E. MARTIN ESTRADA  
2 United States Attorney  
3 DAVID M. HARRIS  
4 Assistant United States Attorney  
5 Chief, Civil Division  
6 CEDINA M. KIM  
7 Assistant United States Attorney  
8 Senior Litigation Counsel, Civil Division  
9 SUSAN L. SMITH, CSBN 253808  
10 Special Assistant United States Attorney  
11 Social Security Administration  
12 160 Spear Street, Suite 800  
13 San Francisco, California 94105-1545  
14 Telephone: (510) 970-4857  
15 E-mail: susan.l.smith@ssa.gov

JS-6

16 Attorneys for Defendant

17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
18  
19 FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
20  
21 WESTERN DIVISION

22 CHRISTOPHER D. WILLIAMS,

23 Plaintiff,

24 v.

25 KILOLO KIJAKAZI, Acting  
26 Commissioner of Social Security,

27 Defendant.

CASE No. 2:22-cv-09066-AB-PVC

[PROPOSED] JUDGMENT OF REMAND

1 The Court having approved the parties' Stipulation to Voluntary Remand  
2 Pursuant to Sentence Four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) and to Entry of Judgment  
3 ("Stipulation to Remand") lodged concurrently with the Judgment of Remand, IT IS  
4 HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that the above captioned  
5 action is remanded to the Commissioner of Social Security for further proceedings  
6 consistent with the terms of the Stipulation to Remand.<sup>1</sup>  
7  
8

9  
10 DATED: May 18, 2023



HON. PEDRO V. CASTILLO  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23 <sup>1</sup> In *Bastidas v. Chappell*, 791 F.3d 1155 (9th Cir. 2015), the Ninth Circuit held  
24 that the magistrate judge had the authority to grant Petitioner's request to dismiss two  
25 unexhausted claims in his habeas petition without the approval of a district judge, as the  
26 magistrate judge's order was simply "doing what [the] habeas petitioner has asked." *Id.*  
27 at 1165. While *Bastidas* is not entirely on point, the stipulation for remand and entry of  
judgment here is jointly made by the parties, without any compulsion from the  
magistrate judge. Because there appears to be no danger of undue prejudice to any  
party, the Court grants the request.